



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,024	06/11/2001	Philip S. Coulthard	CA920010014US1/2182P	3395

7590 06/27/2006

Sawyer Law Group LLP
P.O. Box 51418
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/879,024

Applicant(s)

COULTHARD ET AL.

Examiner

Kyle R. Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 30 May 2006.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-14 and 16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro et al. (US 2002/0120787, filed 28 February 2001, hereafter Shapiro) and further in view of Sarkar et al. (US 2004/0015839, filed 9 April 2001, hereafter Sarkar).

As per independent claim 1, Shapiro discloses a method for converting display source code of a legacy application having mixed business and presentation logic on a server to a network interactive web-browser page, the method comprising:

- Resolving the display source code of the legacy application into a plurality of record formats (paragraphs 0090-0091) each record format corresponding to source code associated with an input/output screen of a legacy application (paragraphs 0090-0091; 0109; 0130-0135: Here, XML files are stored in the database. These XML files reference functions and data of the legacy application; paragraphs 0063-0064 and 0090: Here, a requested document, an

HTML document, is displayed in a web browser. Further, the requested document is analyzed, and based upon the analysis, information is created)

- Parsing each record format into a corresponding intermediate file that is renderable by a web browser (paragraph 0063; paragraphs 0121 and 0130-0135)

Shapiro fails to specifically disclose each intermediate file including:

- The static content corresponding to an unchanging portion of a given input/output screen of the legacy application
- The dynamic content corresponding to a dynamic portion of the given input/output screen that is filled in at runtime by the legacy application

However, Sarkar discloses each intermediate file including:

- The dynamic content corresponding to a dynamic portion of the given input/output screen that is filled in at runtime by the legacy application (paragraph 0011)
- The static content corresponding to an unchanging portion of a given input/output screen of the legacy application (paragraphs 0010 and 0040: Here, static variables define static components of a JavaServer Page)

Shapiro further fails to disclose converting the static content of each intermediate file to a corresponding web page for display on the web browser including creating dynamic components for populating the web page based on the dynamic content of the intermediate file. However, Sarkar discloses converting the static content of each intermediate file to a corresponding web page for display on the web browser including

creating dynamic components for populating the web page based on the dynamic content of the intermediate file (paragraphs 0010-0011 and 0040).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Sarkar with Shapiro, since it would have allowed a user to define common interfaces for export of properties, attributes, events, and methods (Sarkar: paragraph 0007).

As per dependent claim 2, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses wherein each web page is displayed on the internet (paragraphs 0062).

As per dependent claim 3, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses wherein each web page is displayed on a network selected from the group consisting of: an internal network, an Intranet, a LAN, a WAN, an internal bus, a wireless network (paragraphs 0062-0063).

As per dependent claim 4, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses wherein each intermediate file is an XML language file (paragraph 0061).

As per dependent claim 5, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses use of an HTML file (paragraph 0061).

As per dependent claim 6, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro fails to

specifically disclose use of a WML file. However, WML was well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention as being an XML protocol for specifying markup for WAP devices. While Shapiro does not specifically disclose WML, Shapiro does disclose use of wireless connections (paragraph 0063) and XML (paragraph 0061). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined WML with Shapiro, since it would have allowed a user of a WAP enabled device to obtain legacy data.

As per dependent claim 7, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Sarkar further discloses wherein each web page further comprises a JavaServer Page (paragraph 0010). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Sarkar with Shapiro, since it would have allowed a user to define common interfaces for export of properties, attributes, events, and methods (Sarkar: paragraph 0007).

As per dependent claim 8, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Sarkar further discloses wherein the dynamic components further comprise JavaBeans (paragraph 0010-0011). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Sarkar with Shapiro, since it would have allowed a user to define common interfaces for export of properties, attributes, events, and methods (Sarkar: paragraph 0007).

As per dependent claim 9, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses wherein each web page is stored on the server (paragraphs 0067-0071).

As per independent claims 10-13, the applicant recites the limitations that are substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claims 10-13 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 14, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses performing steps of the method at development time during which a user is preparing a new user interface for the legacy application (paragraph 0086: Here, the data mining system determines functions calls that can be made to a legacy application and stores them in a repository prior to a user issuing a function call).

As per dependent claim 16, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Sarkar further discloses wherein parsing the display file data description source and converting each intermediate file are each executed during development time of the web-browser page and the dynamically updating the at least one web page and displaying the dynamically updated web page are each executed during runtime (paragraphs 0010-0011). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined since it would have allowed a user to define common interfaces for export of properties, attributes, events, and methods (Sarkar: paragraph 0007).

5. Claim 15 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro and Sarkar, and further in view of Guheen et al. (US 6721713, filed 27 May 1999, hereafter Guheen).

As per dependent claim 15, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro fails to specifically disclose performing operations offline without a remote connection to the server upon which the application resides. However, Guheen discloses performing methods offline (column 210, lines 14-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Guheen with Shapiro and Sarkar, since it would have allowed a user to minimize data requests while pages were being generated.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 30 May 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that neither Shapiro nor Sarkar and Green disclose resolving display source code of a legacy application into a plurality of record formats, in which each record format corresponds to source code associated with an input/output screen of a legacy application (page 10). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Shapiro discloses the use of a client computer running a web browser (paragraph 0062). Through the web browser, a user requests documents for display, in this instance an HTML document (paragraphs 0063-0064). Further, the client computer can connect to

a backend system (item 112), which may be a legacy system (paragraph 0089) through an application server (items 180A and 180B) (Figure 2C). Further, a Data Mining Computer System may be connected through a network (item 84) to the backend system (item 112) (Figure 5; paragraph 0086). This data mining computer system determines functionality and stores information regarding the backend system (paragraph 0086). The analyzed information from the backend system is stored in a plurality of database record formats (paragraph 0091).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER